Case 4:06-cv-00483 BE

Jerry J. Jarzombek, Esq. 714 W. Magnolia Avenue Fort Worth, Texas 76104 817-348-8325 817-348-8328 fax

Filed 07/11/2006

Page 1 of 8

FILED

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DIST. OF TX.

ET WOOTH DIVISION

2006 JUL 11 PM 3: 26

CLERK OF COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

§

§

§

Document 1

KIMBERLY BARRETT,

Plaintiff,

VS.

NCO PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **4-0** 6 CV - 483 - Y

COMPLAINT and DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

(Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

Preliminary Statement

1. Plaintiff, Kimberly Barrett ("Barrett") brings this action under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), as well as under the Texas Debt Collection Act, Tex. Finance Code § 392.001, et seq. ("TDCA") and the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Subchapter E, Chapter 17, Business & Commerce Code ("DTPA"), to obtain statutory damages, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and other relief for the Defendant's violations of the FDCPA, the TDCA and the DTPA.

Filed 07/11/2

2. Defendant, NCO Portfolio Management, Inc. ("NCO") attempted to collect a consumer debt ("Debt") allegedly owed by Plaintiff, arising from a purported obligation to the AT7T Universal Card. The obligation ("Debt") required Plaintiff to pay money arising out of transactions in which money, property, insurance, or services were the subject thereof and the same were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. NCO claims to have acquired the Debt.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. Jurisdiction of this Court attains pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337(a), and the doctrine of pendent jurisdiction for the TDCA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- Venue in the Northern District of Texas is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)-(c) and 4. because the acts and transactions occurred here and the Defendants transact business here.

Parties

- Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of Texas. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by 15 5. U.S.C. § 1692a(3) and Tex. Finance Code § 392.001(1).
- NCO is an entity engaged in the business of collecting consumer debts in the Northern 6. District of Texas. The principal purpose of NCO's business is the collection of consumer debts which it has acquired, after default. NCO does not extend credit to any of the consumers whose debt it acquires. Rather, the sole purpose of the acquisition of these defaulted debts is their collection, for profit. NCO is a "debt collector" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) and Tex. Finance Code § 392.001(6). NCO is also a "third-party debt collector" as defined by Tex. Finance Code § 392.001(7).

Factual Allegations

Filed 07/11/2006

- On or about August 10, 2005, NCO filed suit in the 48th Judicial District Court of 7. Tarrant County, Texas, under Cause No. 048-212896-05 (the "State Court Case"). Said suit was styled NCO Portfolio Management, Inc., Assignee of ATT Universal.
- Cause No. 048-212896-05 sought recovery under a theory of open account. Plaintiff 8. does not remember ever having an account with AT&T Universal Card; Plaintiff does remember that her wallet was stolen on two occasions while residing in League City, Texas.
- 9. All theories of recovery pleaded in the State Court Case were barred by the applicable statute of limitations, as more than four years has passed since the date of default. In a call that Plaintiff placed to NCO, a representative of NCO told Plaintiff that the account made the basis of the state court lawsuit was charged off by the original creditor in "January 2001."
 - Plaintiff incurred attorney's fees in the defense of the frivolous State Court Case. 10.
- After reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, the Plaintiff says 11. that the Plaintiff will have evidentiary support to show that NCO was aware of their groundless suit in the State Court Case, and elected to prosecute their case without regard for the meritless allegations in their pleading.
- The foregoing acts and omissions were undertaken on behalf of the Defendant by their 12. respective officers, agents, or employees acting at all times relevant hereto within the scope of that relationship.
- The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant were undertaken willfully, 13. intentionally, knowingly, and/or in gross disregard of the rights of the Plaintiff.

14. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant were undertaken indiscriminately and persistently, as part of its regular and routine collection efforts, and without regard to or consideration of the identity or rights of the Plaintiff.

First Claim for Relief

Filed 07/11/2

- The Plaintiff repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing para-15. graphs. The Defendant's violations of the FDCPA include, but are not limited to the a. following:
 - In violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d, the Defendant engaged in conduct the a. natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse a person in connection with the collection of a debt, which conduct included:
 - i. Filing suit on a time-barred debt;
 - Seeking recovery on theories that have no basis in law or fact, and are ii. therefore groundless.
 - In violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, 15 U.S.C. § 1692e (2)(a), 15 U.S.C. § b. 1692e(10), and the "least sophisticated consumer standard," the Defendant used objectively false representations and/or false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a consumer debt.
 - In violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) and the "least sophisticated consumer c. standard," the Defendant threatened to take an action (and took such an action) which cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.
 - In violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f, the Defendant used unfair or unconsciond. able means to collect or attempt to collect a consumer debt, which conduct included:
 - i. Filing suit on a time-barred debt;
 - Seeking recovery on theories that have no basis in law or fact, and are ii. therefore groundless.

16. Under 15 USC § 1692k, the Defendant's violations of the FDCPA render it liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, statutory damages, declaratory relief, costs, and reasonable attorney's fees.

Second Claim for Relief

- The Plaintiff repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing 17. paragraphs. The Defendants' violations of the TDCA include, but are not limited to the following:
 - In violation of Tex. Fin. Code § 392.301(a)(8), Defendant threatened to take a. (and/or did take) an action prohibited by law.

Filed 07/11/20

- In violation of Tex. Fin. Code § 392.304(a)(8), the Defendant misrepresented b. the character of a consumer debt.
- In violation of Tex. Fin. Code § 392.304(a)(19), Defendant used false c. representations and deceptive means to collect a consumer debt.
- 18. Under Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403, the Defendant's violations of the TDCA render it liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, statutory damages, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, costs, and reasonable attorney's fees.

Third Claim for Relief

- The Plaintiff repeats, realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing 19. paragraphs. Pursuant to Tex.Fin.Code Ann. § 392.404, the Defendant's violations of the TDCA also constitute a deceptive trade practice under Subchapter E, Chapter 17, Business & Commerce Code ("DTPA"), and is actionable under that subchapter.
- Under Tex. Bus. & Com. Code Ann. § 17.50(b)(2), the Defendant's violations of the 20. DTPA render it liable to Plaintiff for injunctive relief, and reasonable attorney's fees.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that this Court:

- 1. Declare that Defendant's actions violate the FDCPA, the TDCA and the DPTA.
- 2. Enjoin the Defendant's actions which violate the TDCA and the DTPA.
- 3. Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant for actual damages, statutory damages, costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and/or Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403
- 4. Grant such further relief as deemed just.

Dated: July 10, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry J. Jarzombek

Texas Bar No. 10589050

714 W. Magnolia Avenue Fort Worth, Texas 76104

Voice: 817-348-8325 Fax: 817-348-8328

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands trial by jury in this action.

Dated: July 10, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry J. Jarzombek

Texas Bar No. 10589050

714 W. Magnolia Avenue

Fort Worth, Texas 76104 Voice: 817-348-8325

Fax: 817-348-8328

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF